

# REFORM MOVEMENTS AND IDEAS

*By*  
**John T. Hull**



**T**HIS PAMPHLET is No. 2 of a series, the purpose of which is to give wider distribution to the Lectures delivered at the Co-operative School, held in June, 1929, at the University of Saskatchewan under the joint auspices of the Saskatchewan farm organizations directly identified with the co-operative movement, namely, the Saskatchewan Live Stock Pool, the Saskatchewan Poultry Pool, The Saskatchewan Registered Seed Growers, The United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), The Western Producer, and The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool.



# REFORM MOVEMENTS AND IDEAS

JOHN T. HULL

**H**OW human society began, and the causes of its development and continuous transformation, have been the subject of philosophic speculation from very early times; and despite the great increase in our knowledge in modern days it still remains a fruitful field of speculation. Man is not unique in that he lives in society; no living being is entirely solitary, nor is communal life the exception in animal life. The perpetuation of the species alone demands a relationship more or less permanent and when we come to human beings we find the family a positive necessity for the preservation of the young. Among men there is no record whatever of any time when a societal relationship did not exist. The family, the tribe, the clan, the village community, the nation, represent the development of social relations from the simple to the complex and along with this development there has always gone some kind of an effort to hold men together from the outside.

This external control we call government and, regardless of the names by which we designate its forms, government means and always has meant the rule of a dominant class within the community. Ideas of the supernatural led to a class which stood between man and the great unknown and which developed into sacerdotal institutions of great power and influence. The settling down of nomadic tribes into agricultural communities led to the institution of private property and with it the emergence of an owning group with economic and, as a consequence, political power. With all its faults the former institution became the repository of the best thought and the highest ideals of the community, while the latter developed into militaristic institutions ever reaching out for wealth and power and in the process utilizing as a means to achieve their ends, the growing mass of the weak and propertyless.

Thus the history of humanity is the history of community endeavoring to conquer community to widen the power and increase the wealth of the economically strong, and within the community itself a struggle of class against class, of slaves against masters, plebeians against patricians, the have-nots against the haves, and democracy against aristocracy and other classes of privilege. Always the dominant class believed itself divinely appointed to rule and from the beginning of civilization down to today it has invented for its own support fictions to account for

its supremacy and to reform the masses it oppressed. So, as J. R. Macdonald says, "The double thread of exploitation and revolt against exploitation, runs through all history." It is with the thread of revolt that I am going to deal.

I have said that with all their faults it was the sacerdotal, the religious institutions, that became the repository of the ideals of the people. It is necessary to understand this if we would understand the movements toward social justice in the past. It is easy for us, today, to think of righteousness apart from religious ideas, but that is a condition exclusive to the modern world. From the dawn of civilization down to comparatively modern times, ethics and religion meant the same thing and social justice has developed only to the extent that it could call religion in to its aid. Thus, in India, the ancient Brahmanic religion placed the working man in the lowest class in society and excluded from religious ceremonies, the incendiary, the poisoner and the manual worker. The farmer and the shepherd were put in the same class as the seducer of innocent girls. The religious reformer, Buddha, did nothing to correct this classification. He preached renunciation and suffering. The world itself was evil and the one and only thing to do was to overcome the craving to live and so earn eternal rest. Buddha preached a spiritual social democracy in which man was to be so exalted that he would be utterly indifferent to the necessities of his body. These two religions, the one with its brutal caste system and its debasement of the worker, the other with its indifference to the things of this world, explain to a very large extent the backwardness of India.

Close by, the religion of Zoroaster developed. In it labor was dignified and the creation of wealth for the common good extolled. Zoroastrianism, with its doctrine of a good and an evil force in an eternal struggle and the necessity for the good to be constantly engaged in an effort to destroy evil, was at least a gospel of hope for the poor and an influence of encouragement in the struggle for right.

The oldest code of laws that we have is that of King Hammurabi, who reigned in Babylon about 2,000 years B.C. There are a number of clauses in the code, dealing with the cultivators of the soil, and one clause in particular I am sure will appeal to you. This clause provides that when a farmer has borrowed money to put in a crop and the gods, in their multitudinous activities, include the destruction of his crop—in other words, when the crop is lost because of weather conditions—then that farmer shall pay no interest for that year, on the money he has borrowed. I think there is something essentially just in making the acts of God extend to creditors, as well as debtors, and if that kind of law had prevailed in all nations, the lot of the farmer might have been other than that of the helot of civilization. The farmers have been a debtor class from the beginning of civilization. Fourteen hundred years after Hammurabi, the great lawgiver of ancient Athens, Solon, in a period of great economic distress among the people, introduced reforms into the Athenian constitution which included the following: limitation on the accumulation of land; no enslavement for debt; and the cancellation of all debts, public and private. These reforms indicate the condition into which the workers on the land had fallen owing to the accumulation of land in a few hands and the enslavement of the farmers because of inability to pay their debts. The privileged classes took good care the reforms were ineffective.

You have no doubt heard something of the Greek city state, Greek democracy, and the Greek ideal of liberty. Also, you may have been

taught, when in school, that Magna Carta was the foundation of British liberty. The word "liberty" does not occur in Magna Carta, but it does refer to "liberties" and what it means is that whatever status of the classes in English history existed at that time, should be maintained, which was a very fine arrangement for the barons, but a very poor one for the masses of the English people. So with liberty in Greece; it meant the liberty of classes subsisting on the toil and sweat of a mass of slaves. Democracy, as Aristotle tells us, meant rule by freemen, not rule by the mass of the people. The Greeks had a profound contempt for the working classes; they excluded them from religious associations on the ground that the working people had no souls.

Five centuries or so later a similar reform to that of Solon with regard to land, was attempted in Rome by the tribunes Tiberius and Caius Gracchus. Both were murdered and were immediately honored by the fickle public with monuments. The economic misery in Rome owing to the rise of an idle, luxurious and grasping plutocracy was appalling. Again and again the oppressed people rose in revolt, only to be mercilessly suppressed, the greatest of these revolts being led by the slave gladiator, Spartacus. This Thracian shepherd ranks among the world's great military leaders. He gathered around him the discontented, the despoiled, and the dispossessed, the men who were condemned to work on the estates of the wealthy landowners, branded and chained; and for two years he beat the best armies that Rome could send against him. He marched through the land, liberating the slaves as he went; and if the hundred thousand men who flocked to his standard had taken his advice, their victories might have been turned to their economic and social advantage. He found it impossible, however, to maintain order and unity among them and finally they were overwhelmed in defeat and six thousand of them were crucified.

But revolts occurred again and again and the number of the poor increased, even as the tribute exacted by her victorious armies poured into the treasury of Rome and into the coffers of a privileged class.

It is to Palestine that we must turn for definite, positive, unequivocal protest against exploitation, condemnation of oppression and fervent upholding of the law of righteousness in social relations. The Hebrew state was a theocracy; the people had a direct contract with Jehovah. From Him they received the law by which their lives and the relations with each other and with their neighbors were to be regulated, and Jehovah was their ground landlord. The land belonged to Him and it was used in the common welfare as He directed. And when the people backslided, when they ran after strange gods, when they sought to pile up wealth by unjust and oppressive treatment of their neighbors, when they turned their faces toward Mammón and forgot Jehovah, then a prophet would arise who would preach the gospel of righteousness to the face of the evil doers.

"The prophets," says Winwood Reade, "were always the tribunes of the people; the protectors of the poor. As the tyrant revelled in his palace on the taxes extorted from the industrious peasants, a strange figure would descend from the mountains and stalking to the throne, would stretch forth a lean and swarthy arm and denounce him in the name of Jehovah and bid him repent or the Lord's wrath would fall on him and dogs would drink his blood." There is, I know, another side to this aspect of Jewish life and I know that the prophets did many things of which we would not today approve, but no one can read Amos, the shepherd of Tahoe, or the relevant passages in Isaiah, Ezekiel and

others, without being impressed with their zeal for social justice and their courage in declaring it. The prophets do not divorce ethics from economics and politics. They denounce selfishness as a motive in human action; they base the state solidly on the idea of right and the life of the people on righteousness and justice; and their lofty ideas of social morality had a profound influence in the subsequent Christian world.

Among the Hebrews there was a sect which I must mention—the Essenes. This sect practiced communism; they cultivated land in common; they held their goods in common; and they ate at a common table which was prepared by their priests. I mention this briefly as most interesting sect, simply for the purpose of drawing attention to the fact that communism was both known and practiced among the Hebrews, before the Christian era.

The practice of a communistic life, however, was not peculiar to the Hebrews. Particular, limited and voluntary associational life appears to have existed from the earliest time and without it the lot of the poor would have been entirely unbearable. There were mutual aid societies in ancient Greece, and antiquarians have unearthed, literally, the evidence of large numbers of them in Italy; while the Italian republics of the Middle Ages were a revival of ancient Roman self-supporting communities or municipalities.

All of you have read English history and you doubtless remember that after the Romans left England there were successive invasions of peoples from the northwestern parts of Germany—Angles, Saxons and Jutes, the Teutonic peoples. These people lived in village communities, and they brought the village institution with them into England. Just exactly what took place in the England of that day, precisely how the social organization was modified by contact with the indigenous inhabitants and Roman organization, is one of the most difficult studies in English history. There are two schools, one of which believes that English history begins with a free village community—that is, a community of free men cultivating a common land by co-operative activities and subject to a communal chief, each man being of equal status. The other school contends that the system was one with a few free men and a larger number of unfree men tied to the soil and obliged to render services to the lord of the community. The bulk of opinion is with the former school.

This is not the place for me to go into this intricate question in detail. Whether English history originates with a free community which is gradually reduced to slavery, or an enslaved community, which gradually worked its way to freedom, is, as I have said, a difficult and unsettled question and for my purpose it is unimportant. The essential thing is that there was a community and there was a co-operative life, and the historical course of events is away from the co-operative and communal life to the competitive and individualistic life.

In the writings of ancient philosophers we find a regretful looking back to the times when men lived in this communal, co-operative life. A Roman poet (Virgil) sings of the time when

"No fences parted fields, nor marks nor bounds  
Divided acres of tillage grounds,  
But all was common."

Listen to the Roman philosopher Seneca: "The social virtues had remained pure and inviolate before covetousness distracted society and introduced poverty, for men ceased to possess all things when they began to call anything their own. The first men and their immediate descendants followed nature, pure and uncorrupt. How happy was the primitive age when the bounties of nature lay in common and were used promiscuously; nor had avarice and luxury disunited mortals and made them prey upon one another. They enjoyed all nature in common, which thus gave them secure possession of the public wealth. Why should I not think them the richest of all people, among whom there was not to be found one poor man."

Among the early Christians the same views prevailed. They believed that private property and the individual desire for riches, were the source of all evil. You remember the story in the Acts of the Apostles where the new body of Christians were putting their possessions into a common holding and two of them fished about it with disastrous results to themselves. The wealthy have never been condemned in harsher language than is used about them in the New Testament and the early church fathers are explicit about the communism of the body of the faithful. In his work "The Apostles" Ernest Renan has described the ideal of the original Christian society: "All then lived in common, having but one heart and one soul. No one possessed aught that was his own. In becoming a disciple of Jesus a man sold all he had and gave the proceeds to the society. The chiefs of the society then distributed the common goods to each according to his needs. The concord was perfect; there was no quarrel over dogma, no dispute about precedence. The tender memory of Jesus effaced all dissensions. The recollection of those first two or three years lingered as that of an earthly paradise, which Christianity was thenceforth to pursue in all its dreams and was vainly to seek to recover."

In that paragraph is summed up the ideals and the aspirations of Christianity for seventeen centuries. The Christian faith was that all Christians were equal before God, that they were partakers in common of the things that are incorruptible and, with more force, should be partakers in common of the corruptible things. Private property, therefore, was incompatible with the Christian faith. We cannot understand the revolts of the exploited in the Middle Ages unless we grasp this teaching of Christian bodies.

Of forms of communal life not purely voluntary, the oldest is that of the village community, about which there is an extensive literature. The village community is to be found in various parts of the world; it exists in India today and existed in Russia down to the Great War. Life in these communities was regulated by custom; its economy was co-operative and the community in the main was self-sustaining and exclusive.

It is said that Solomon's temple was built by union labor. Centuries before Christ, organizations of workers existed and they persisted right down to the break-up of the Roman Empire, with varying fortunes. Archaeologists have discovered the relics of innumerable communal and workers' associations scattered all through Italy. A king of Rome, about 700 B.C., divided these workers' associations into eight great classes. These associations were known as "collegia" and were for the purpose of mutual assistance. There were burial societies, religious societies, social societies, friendly societies with dues and benefits. From ancient Greece and Rome these associations spread all over Europe and they are the first example we have of voluntary association for mutual aid and their ex-

ample was never lost in European history. One of the inscriptions found on these early associations reads as follows: "Because of reliable and just administration of the common fund of money, of the community of Erantatal, and having ever conducted himself with kindness and with honesty; and because he has righteously husbanded the funds exclusively paid by the Erantatal themselves, as well as the annual subscriptions according to the law of the Erantas, and in everything else he still continues to show integrity to the oath which he swore to the Erantatal, therefore hail Alcmeon. The community of the Erantatal rejoices to praise Alcmeon, son of Thon—a stranger who has been naturalized—their president of Erantas, and to crown him with a chaplet of foliage because of his faithfulness and goodwill to them." This inscription dates 400 B.C. and it reads like a modern association passing a vote of appreciation of the services of their secretary.

So, also, among the peasants of the Middle Ages—when feudal lords had assumed all the rights of possessors of the soil and reduced the free cultivators to serfs and bondmen—was there a wistful looking back to the time when they had rights within the community no less inviolable than those of the lord; when lordship meant leadership with the consent of the community; and when no man was without status and freedom.

These voluntary associations and the village community were crushed out in the break-up of the Roman Empire, during the terrific struggles between ecclesiastical and secular powers and the devastating wars which accompanied the great religious schisms we call the Reformation and the rise of nationalism in Europe. The workers' associations were suppressed, the village communities lost their status under feudalism and the peasantry were reduced to serfdom. Beginning about the 11th century, discontent and resentment at the loss of customary rights, coupled to the rise of numerous religious sects which were the forerunners of the Reformation and modern non-conformity, led to desperate efforts on the part of the mass of the people to throw off the yoke of servitude which had been fastened on them by the ruling classes. These efforts had also a basis in the current philosophic and theological thought. It is important to remember that, at this period in European history, religion was the paramount element in human life; and when men began to interpret the Bible in various ways, and especially when they began to take it very seriously as a guide to practical life, an enormous number of religious sects came into existence. These sects were known by the collective name of Cathari, that is, the pure. In the main these sects endeavored to make the Sermon on the Mount the basis for social organization and they declared against war, against the use of force in any form, against private property and against idleness. Let us look at the teaching of some of the leaders in this revolt against authority in Church and State. Joachim of Floris, Italy, (1130-1202) a very pious man who considered himself very orthodox, wrote of a coming of age of freedom when there would be no more war or strife, no social or class distinction, no rich or poor, no private property. All men would live together as brothers in a co-operative community. Extracts from the writings of Joachim were compiled and became known as "The Eternal Gospel" and the eternal gospel practically took the place of the Bible among the Cathari. Joachim's books were banned as heretical.

Another good man was John Duns Scotus (1265-1308). Where John was born is a matter of dispute. He is claimed by Dunstan, Northumberland; by Duns, Shropshire, and by Duns, now Duns, in Ulster. So, whether he is an Englishman, Scotsman, or Irishman, is a matter of doubt. John had no use for the practice, which was becoming common



in his time, of trying to accommodate religious beliefs to the economic and social conditions. Religion to him was a practical thing and a guide to everyday life. It was a divine ordering of things and consequently was not to be explained away by logical quibbling to ease the conscience of wrongdoers. Private property, John said, was the creation of civil law, not natural or divine law, and civil law was the consequence of man's fall from grace when covetousness urged the first man (or more properly the first woman) to reach out for more than he really needed. The proper application of the Christian doctrine to life would mean a return to the state of grace and this would mean brotherhood, co-operation and a communal life. Commerce and trade, John said, were useful, but became evil when men engaged in them as a means of accumulating riches. Men in business should receive adequate remuneration (to express what he says in modern terms) and no man should take exorbitant profits. Therefore the practices of "engrossing," "forestalling" and "regrating" were all evil and should not be permitted. I ought to explain what these practices of engrossing, forestalling and regrating were, because they were condemned by thinkers of the Middle Ages, resented by the masses of the people and forbidden by act of parliament.

**Forestallers** were persons buying goods or victuals on their way to a market or port, or contracting to buy the same before actually brought for sale, or endeavoring by these, or other means, to enhance the price or prevent supply.

**Regrators** were persons buying corn or other victuals and reselling the same in the same market place, or in any other fair or market within four miles.

**Engrossers** were persons buying corn growing, or any other corn, grain, butter, cheese, fish or any other dead victual, with intent to resell the same again.

Forestallers, regrators, and engrossers thus comprised all middlemen, all those who stood between the producer and the consumer and who endeavored to make money from both. Right down to 1890, English law courts held that forestalling was an offence at common law as well as statute law, which, of course, means that it was against ancient and traditional custom. The laws against forestalling, regrating and engrossing were repealed in 1844, but their presence on the statute books down to that date may be taken as an indication of how public opinion regarded the middlemen in business, from time immemorial.

John Wycliffe (1320-1384) was another of the forerunners of the Reformation whose teaching helped to stimulate the revolt of the masses of the people. He also was opposed to private property and especially to a property-holding church. To him the ideal was a social state resting on "The Sermon on the Mount," governed by a good king who realized that he ruled by divine grace.

Then we have John Ball (1336-1381) the mad priest of Kent. John Ball was a real leader of the people and it was in his preaching, John Richard Green tells us, "that England first listened to the knell of feudalism and the declaration of the rights of man."

Listen to John Ball preaching to a crowd in the market place after Mass on Sunday morning:

"My good friends, matters cannot go on well in England until all

things shall be in common; when there shall be neither vassals nor lords; when the lords shall be no more masters than ourselves. How ill they behave to us; for what reason do they thus hold us in bondage: are we not all descendants from the same parents, Adam and Eve? And what can they show us, what reason can they give why they should be more masters than ourselves? They are clothed in velvet and rich stuffs, ornamented with ermine and soft furs, while we are forced to wear poor clothing. They have wines, spices and fine bread, while we have only rye and the refuse of the straw; and when we drink it must be water. They have handsome seats and manors, while we must brave the wind and rain in our labors in the field; and it is by our labor they have wherewith to support their pomp. We are called slaves, and if we do not perform our service we are beaten, and we have no sovereign to whom we can complain, or who would be willing to hear us. Let us go to the king and remonstrate with him; he is young, and from him we may obtain a favorable answer, and if not, we must ourselves seek to amend our condition."

These leaders of the people were, in effect, expressing opinions based on most authoritative theological and philosophical speculations. From the very earliest times, theologians had condemned the taking of interest, and in applying ethical ideas to business practice, they had reached the idea of the just price, that for all goods there was a price which adequately remunerated the seller, and that it was wrong for any man to charge more than this just price for anything he had to sell. On this idea of the just price a mass of legislation was raised in an effort to fix, not only prices of certain commodities, but the wages of laborers. To us, this idea of fixing prices and wages, of putting around business all kinds of hampering restrictions, may seem all wrong, but once again we must remember that the idea back of all this thought and legislation in the Middle Ages and onwards was the maintaining of customary ways of doing things, the maintaining of certain relations amongst classes; and perhaps it may be said, the idea of arranging social relations in such a way that justice would prevail.

The result of all this ferment in the midst of which John Ball preached was the peasant insurrection of 1381, popularly known as Wat Tyler's Rebellion. The workers in the towns joined the peasants in demanding the restitution of ancient and customary rights, the privileges of the village community and the associations of workers, and freedom from oppressive duties and services.

Men who held land by customary tenure were trying to escape from their condition of servitude. They demanded the abolition of feudal services; forced labor on the lord's domain; merchet, or the payment of a fine on the marriage of their daughters; heriot, the handing over of the most valuable piece of movable property on the death of the worker; the payment of a fine every time they sold a horse or a cow; the obligation to grind their corn at the lord's mill, and a number of other irritating customs which remained as the badge of their servitude. They formed unions—the forerunners of our United Farmers!—and they took an oath to "resist lord and bailiff and to refuse their due custom and service."

The insurrection (1381) was suppressed. Says Thorold Rogers: "Once in the history of England only, once perhaps only in the history of the world, peasants and artisans attempted to effect a revolution by force. They nearly succeeded."









should be started actually, education should be general and compulsory and every child trained in labor and in learning. Parliament should also encourage the development of knowledge and experiment and invention to the end that the people as a whole should know more and have more.

After promulgating the gospel of the earth for all, Winstantley and his friends set out to give it practical effect. A band of them settled on St. George's Hill, a Surrey estate, and continued to till it. The government at first was inclined to treat them as a band of harmless fanatics, but as the settlement increased and they declared themselves that others were coming and other lands would be similarly invaded and appropriated the government took action and the settlement was destroyed.

But Winstantley kept right on. He might not dig, but he could still talk and write. All these very day poor people are forced to work for 40 a day and work to death. And the ruling priest stops their mouths and to them the great satisfaction of mind was secured by the declaration. The poor shall inherit the earth. I tell you the scripture is to be truly and indelibly fulfilled. I am just of the name Leveller. I tell you Jesus Christ is the head Leveller."

The difference between the purely political reformers and Winstantley was that he wanted the freedom about which everybody was talking and for which the Civil War was fought to go right down to the masses of the people and to be economic as well as political. To him the revolution was failure if it did not bring with it to the actual workers of the country better living conditions and great happiness.

That is what makes him a unique figure, a that starlike period and brings him much closer to the reformers of today than any other figure in the revolution. He alone of his contemporaries refused to divorce economics from justice or righteousness from either. The wife represents not only the economic life of the people and all the other features of the human life, but also the ideal. None of them were not accompanied as they were not by accompanying economic reforms to help the people achieve a better life. And that is the way we think of reform today for although we may reason differently we have the same aims.

From the 17th century onwards there was a great deal of writing on economic and social questions. The new order of capitalism was emerging and the difficulties and their need to accommodate religion and justice to the new order. There were those however who were not concerned that money getting business ought to be provided with a new set of religious words and social maxims. Peter Chamberlain, in 1666, declared that what was the source of all wealth and all the workers, being the actual producers of it were the backbone of the nation and entitled to every right there was. He made the first proposals for the nationalization of the land and the mines and the appropriation by taxation of the unearned increment both of land and capital for the public service.

Peter Chamberlain Van Buren in 1666 wrote a book entitled A Way to Make the Poor in These and Other Nations Happy in which he proposed this communalization or practically voluntary co-operative societies for trade and commerce. They could be used be operated far more cheaply than private concerns. From their profits they should build schools and reduce the rich to send their children to them as they





striated and even the minor rights enjoyed by the workers were unimpinged. Take for instance the ancient practice of gleaming. By a decision of an English court in 1788 it was laid down that the poor had no right to glean. Their old judge descended from the decision and he stoutly maintained that gleaming was a customary right of the people of a village and that it belonged to proprietary rights of the land-owners. The decision however was hated with gloe by those who maintained that the extinguishing of these rights of the workers was an economic gain for the country. In fact throughout the whole process of reducing the land worker to a state of economic dependence and poverty the poor never lost a right but what the rich congratulated them as getting something better. Listen to one of these dispossessed workers. I kept four cows before the parish was enclosed and now I do not keep so much as a goose and you ask me what I lose by it. Perhaps you have heard the old rhyme.

The law will punish man or woman  
Who steals the goose from off the common,  
But lets the larger criminal loose  
Who steals the common from the goose.

It was maintained by land-owners, clergymen, statesmen and politicians that the losses of individuals were gains to the state and that the distress of the poor was a necessary and inevitable condition of progress, the birth pains of a new society. The poor protested against the loss of their land and resources by which they were being robbed of their land and their rights but in protest to parliament the poor petitioned and unlearned had no earthly chance against the skilled advocates who for ample remuneration presented the case for the land-owners. Parliaments and courts were against the poor. Let me quote a few examples. One of the bugs that the poor asked for was the reduction of fines. Mr Justice Lush said that "I was highly amused in such men to require of gentlemen who had by an expensive education qualified themselves to discharge the sacred duties of a member of the grand jury to descend from the station and reduce themselves to the situation of common labourers. Here also a report of the county of Hampshire, prepared by a Mr. Stoughton in 1794. The use of common and by labourers operates upon the mind as a staff of independence. When the commons are enclosed, The labourers will work every day in the year. Their children will be put out to school early and their subsistence and the lower ranks of society which in the present times is so much wanted, would be thereby considerably secured."

Mr. Charles Wilson, who made another county report declared that the system "hardens the heart and causes a good deal of mischief and at the same time puts the person in an unfavourable position for the approach of what might be serviceable to a moral and religious point of view."

The first act enclosing lands was passed in 1606. By the beginning of the 19th century 1760 acts had been passed and between 1800 and 1844, other 2800 acts had been passed. Enclosures from the beginning of the 18th century to 1780, dated 600,000 acres and in the next fifty years over a million acres of common lands were enclosed. Thorold Rogers says "From 1606 to 1824 a conspiracy, executed by the law and carried out by parties interested in its execution was entered upon to cheat the English workman of his wages to the end to deprive him of hope and to degrade him into irremediable poverty."









and the following are the results of the regression analysis:

A petition for the Charter was circulated throughout the country and largely directed the way for parliament. A powerful movement to push the Charter among the people and to arrange for its present shape for parliament was born at Salisbury. This movement, led by some pioneer men of different countries, English and French, the strong and energetic thinking, men of different times and countries, they thought that the government of the day, and the people, the nation. When the parliament first met, the petition was in the hands of the king and the lords and the commons. The king, the lords and the commons were all in a state of mind. The king was much interested in the petition. The lords and the commons were much interested in the petition. The king, the lords and the commons were all in a state of mind. The king was much interested in the petition. The lords and the commons were much interested in the petition.

Level was subsequently arrested and used for padding. A month after Jack found him guilty that he was involved in experimenting for better results for health being raised in getting the nicotine. It may be noted in passing that five of the parents of the father are today regarded as homosexuals and dependent on medication.

The "Impact of government" aspect was ignored and perceived not as regulated discrimination but as before there had been equal access, both in and out of government and a little reduction of the perceived racism and just noted that very little of people's discrimination.

[illegible]

That this was the basic philosophy in which cooperation as a practical means of improving man's condition as life as a means of making logical sense out of labor-saving machines was born. This latter idea, let me contribute by saying that took, from the beginning, the form of the co-operative movement. What it is all about is another matter.









THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC  
AND  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ART  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN  
INVITE YOU TO AN EVENING OF  
COMPOSITIONS BY

**MURRAY ADASKIN**  
PROFESSOR OF MUSIC

AND AN EXHIBITION OF  
SCULPTURE, PAINTINGS, DRAWINGS AND  
PRINTS BY

**ELI BORNSTEIN**  
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ART

CONVOCATION HALL  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1954  
8.30 p.m.

RECITAL AND EXHIBITION TO BE OPENED BY  
PRESIDENT W. P. THOMPSON

## PROGRAMME

---

MURRAY ADASKIN, Violinist

MARIO BERNARDI, Pianist

1. CANZONA AND RONDO, 1949      For Violin and Piano

2. SONATINE BAROQUE, 1952      For unaccompanied Violin

Adagio

Andante

Allegro

### INTERMISSION

3. SONATA FOR PIANO, 1950

With free and gentle motion

Moderate, but rhythmic

Slow

Finale, Quick and lively

4. SONATA FOR VIOLIN AND PIANO, 1946

Moderato

Andante

Rondo-Allegro

## EXHIBITION

---

### SCULPTURE

1. HEAD, marble on walnut base, 1947,  
on loan from the permanent collection of the Walker  
Art Centre, Minneapolis, Minn.
2. SAILBOAT, Gabbro stone on marble and walnut base,  
1948.
3. HEAD, sandstone on limestone base, 1950.
4. THE FLYING DUTCHMAN, Tyndal stone on marble base,  
1953.
5. FIGURE, red oak on marble base, 1943.

### PAINTINGS

6. WINTRY SUN, oil-tempera, 1952.
7. STILL LIFE, oil, 1952.
8. BOATS AT CONCARNEAU No. 1, watercolor, 1952.  
Lent by Dr. Gordon W. Snelgrove, Saskatoon.
9. BOATS AT CONCARNEAU, No. 2, watercolor, 1952.
10. LOUYECIENNES, No. 2, watercolor, 1951.  
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Fred S. Mendel, Saskatoon.
11. WHITE BRIDGE, watercolor, 1951.
12. PARIS ARCH, watercolor, 1952.

13. CANAL ST. MARTIN, watercolor, 1952.
14. PORT MARLY, watercolor, 1952.
15. PONT D'AUTEUIL, watercolor, 1951.  
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Moorsom T. Trotter, Edmonton.
16. VIEW OF SASKATOON, watercolor, 1951.
17. GIRL WITH PLANT, watercolor, 1953.
18. CONCARNEAU, watercolor, 1952.
19. ALONG THE SEINE, watercolor, 1952.

#### DRAWINGS AND PRINTS

20. ALLEY AT NIGHT, crayon drawing, 1943.
21. THE WHITE DOME, color etching, 1953.  
Lent by Professor and Mrs. Murray Adaskin.
22. PARIS ARCHES, etching, 1953.  
Lent by Dr. and Mrs. Sydney R. Gelmon, Saskatoon.
23. THE DOME, serigraph, 1953.
24. THE BRIDGE, serigraph, 1953.  
Lent by Dr. and Mrs. Sidney R. Gelmon, Saskatoon.

---

THIS EXHIBITION WILL REMAIN ON VIEW TUESDAY AND  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2 & 3, FROM 10 A.M. UNTIL 10 P.M.

---